



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,798	12/28/2000	Thomas E. Donaldson	06975-146001/ Search2	6269

26171 7590 06/11/2003  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
1425 K STREET, N.W.  
11TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/749,798**

Applicant(s)  
**Donaldson, et al.**

Examiner  
**Nguyen, Cindy**

Art Unit  
**2171**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cindy Nguyen

(3) Safet Metjahic

(2) Joseph Key

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jun 10, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 9, 14, 16, and 19

Identification of prior art discussed:

Tso '602 and Russell

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Referring to Claims 1 and 16, Applicant argued that Tso '602 is directed toward classifying search results, not search terms. Hence, Tso '602 differs from the claimed invention. The Examiners agreed.

Referring to Claims 9 and 19, Applicant argued that Tso '602 differs patently from the claimed subject matter. The examiners disagreed, arguing that Tso '602 reads on the claims in their present form.

Referring to Claim 14, Applicant argued that Tso/Russell do not disclose the separate storage of offensive subject matter and non-offensive subject matter. The examiners disagreed, arguing that the combination results in a system that reads on the claimed subject matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner's signature, if required